

MAR 21 2007

USSN: 10/549,544

Response to Office Action Dated January 17, 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are currently before the Examiner. Claims 1-4 and 6-7 have been amended herein.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the office action rejected claim 1 for unclear Markush language.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify the Markush language. Applicant believes that no new matter has been added with this amendment. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Additionally, the office action rejected claim 7 for lack of clarity in the use of abbreviations.

Applicant has amended claim 7 to replace the abbreviations with the full names intended to be covered thereby. No new matter has been added with this amendment. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph because the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, the office action states the claimed "derivatives" can read on an infinite number of compounds resulting from the potentially infinite number of derivations which can be performed on the recited compounds.

USSN: 10/549,544

Response to Office Action Dated January 17, 2007

Applicant has deleted the word derivatives from the claims. No new matter has been added with this amendment. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 99/46349 Lappalainen et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The office action states that Lappalainen *et al.* disclose a foamed resin adhesive containing the instantly claimed ingredients in the instantly claimed amounts. Lappalainen *et al.* reference the foamed resin adhesive, in the abstract, to comprise 40-80% of an aqueous resin solution, 2-10% of an organic filler or fillers, 1-10% of a cationic acrylamide copolymer, and 0.005-1% of a surface active agent.

In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to further define the foaming agent. Applicant's foaming agent does not teach the usage of a cationic acrylamide copolymer, an element that is required by Lappalainen et al. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being anticipated by WO 99/46349 Lappalainen et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The office action states that Lappalainen *et al.* disclose a foamed resin adhesive containing the instantly claimed ingredients in the instantly claimed amounts in the abstract, and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to use the claimed ingredient combinations. Lappalainen *et al.* reference the foamed resin adhesive in the abstract to comprise 40-80% of an aqueous resin solution, 2-10% of an organic filler or fillers, 1-10% of a cationic acrylamide copolymer, and 0.005-1% of a surface active agent.

In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to further define the foaming agent. Lappalainen *et al.* does not teach or suggest a Applicant's foaming agent as in amended claim 1, because the reference requires it to include a cationic acrylamide copolymer.

USSN: 10/549,544

Response to Office Action Dated January 17, 2007

Additionally it would not have been obvious, by the teaching of Lappalainen *et al.*, that the currently claimed foaming agent would produce an effective and ethical adhesive composition that has very good foamability and allows for good control of foamability to be achieved (see specification page 5, lines 6-10). Nor would it have been obvious to invent an adhesive that has a good and fast spreadability on the surface to be glued, creating an adhesive that is not viscous and divides easily when being spread and creating a reduction in the consumption of adhesive (see specification page 5, lines 19-24). Examples of the adhesive compositions created by Applicant's claims with the benefits not taught by Lappalainen *et al.* can be found in the specification pages 6-9. Therefore, Lappalainen *et al.* do not teach the adhesive composition as currently claimed, nor does the reference teach or suggest that such a composition would provide the benefits of Applicant's adhesive. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. If it would be of any assistance with this application the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard Yuen  
Registration No. L0278

Date: March 21/07

Hexion Specialty Chemicals, Inc.  
1600 Smith Street 24<sup>th</sup> Floor, P.O. Box 4500  
Houston, Texas 77210-4500

Direct Phone: (832) 366-2475  
Direct Facsimile: (281) 205-2050  
richard.yuen@hexion.com